

### REMARKS

These remarks are in response to the Office Action dated March 10, 2009, which had a shortened statutory period for response set to expire June 10, 2009. A Notice of Appeal was filed on September 10, 2009 along with a three-month extension of time. Applicant's appeal brief was due on November 10, 2009. This amendment and Request for Continued Examination are filed to withdraw the above-referenced application from appeal. A five-month extension of time, to expire April 12, 2010 (April 10, 2010 being a Saturday and April 11, 2010 being a Sunday), is requested in a petition filed herewith.

#### Claims

Claims 1-26, 29-30, 34-36, and 40-59 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1-26, 29-30, 34-36, and 40-59 are rejected over prior art. Claims 1, 14, 19, 23, 42-43, 50, 53, and 56-59 are amended, and Claim 60 is added. Claims 27-28, 31-33, and 37-39 were previously canceled. Claims 2, 5-6, 9-10, 18, 20-22, and 25-26 remain as filed, and Claims 3-4, 7-8, 11-13, 15-17, 24, 29-30, 34-36, 40-41, 44-49, 51-52, and 54-55 remain as previously presented. Reconsideration is requested.

#### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-21, 23-26, 30, 34, 40-42, and 45-55, and 57-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2004/0107332 (Fujii et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,023,753 (Pechanek1) and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,507,947 (Schreiber et al.). Claims 5, 15, 22, 29, 35-36, 43-44, and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Fujii et al., Pechanek1, and Schreiber et al. in view of Common Art.

The claims are amended to obviate the rejections over the cited prior art.

#### Claims 1-13, 29-30, 34-36, 40-41, and 45-49:

Claim 1 is amended herein to recite (in part) that "intercommunication between each pair of connected computers is carried out through the processors of each pair of connected

computers.” Support for this amendment is provided in Applicant’s original specification at least in Fig. 2; page 5, lines 6-12; page 7, lines 9-14; and page 9, lines 6-7.

Fujii et al. does not teach or suggest “a plurality of computers” that each includes “a processor for executing the instructions” where “intercommunication between each pair of connected computers is carried out through the processors of each pair of connected computers,” as recited by amended Claim 1. Rather, as shown in Fig. 4A of Fujii et al., the switch elements 108 facilitate communications between the processor elements 102. Additionally, intercommunication between processor elements 102 does not appear to be carried out by the mb ALU 117 or the nb ALU 118 (Fig. 4B).

Similarly, Pechanek1 also does not teach or suggest that “intercommunication between each pair of connected computers is carried out through the processors of each pair of connected computers,” as recited by amended Claim 1. Rather, as shown in FIG. 18, the cluster switches 86 located outside of the PEs facilitate intercommunication between the PEs. (*Pechanek1*, col. 11, lines 25-50).

Finally, Schreiber et al. also does not teach or suggest that “intercommunication between each pair of connected computers is carried out through the processors of each pair of connected computers,” as recited by amended Claim 1. Rather, as shown in FIG. 24, the interconnect 1102 facilitates intercommunication between the functional units (FUs) 1110-1116. (*Schreiber et al.*, col. 36, line 19 to col. 37, line 16).

For the above reasons, because the cited prior art does not teach or suggest all the limitations of amended Claim 1, no prima facie case of obviousness is established with respect to amended Claim 1. Claims 2-13, 29-30, 34-36, 40-41, and 45-49 depend, either directly or indirectly from amended Claim 1 and are, therefore, distinguished from the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as amended Claim 1.

Claims 14-18:

Claim 14 is amended to recite (in part) that “intercommunication between each pair of interconnected computers is carried out through the processors of each pair of interconnected computers.” Therefore, amended Claim 14 distinguishes over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons provided above with respect to amended Claim 1. Claims 15-18 depend directly from amended Claim 14 and are, therefore, distinguished from the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as amended Claim 14.

Claims 19-22:

Claim 19 is amended to recite (in part) that “communication via each of the plurality of data connections is carried out through the processors of the no more than two computers associated with each data connection.” Therefore, amended Claim 19 distinguishes over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons provided above with respect to amended Claim 1. Claims 20-22 depend directly from amended Claim 19 and are, therefore, distinguished from the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as amended Claim 19.

Claims 23-26:

Claim 23 is amended to recite (in part) that “communication via each of the data lines is carried out through the processors of the no more than two computers having access to the data line.” Therefore, amended Claim 23 distinguishes over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons provided above with respect to amended Claim 1. Claims 23-26 depend directly from amended Claim 23 and are, therefore, distinguished from the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as amended Claim 23.

Claim 42:

Claim 42 is amended to recite (in part) that “intercommunication between each pair of connected computers is carried out through the processors of each pair of connected computers.” Therefore, amended Claim 42 distinguishes over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons provided above with respect to amended Claim 1.

Claims 43-44:

Claim 43 is amended to recite (in part) that “communication via each of the data paths is carried out through the processors of the no more than two computers having access to the data path.” Therefore, amended Claim 43 distinguishes over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons provided above with respect to amended Claim 1. Claim 44 depends directly from amended Claim 43 and is, therefore, distinguished from the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as amended Claim 43.

Claims 50-52:

Claim 50 is amended to recite (in part) that “communication via each of the data paths is carried out through the processors of the adjacent pair of the computers having access to the data path.” Therefore, amended Claim 50 distinguishes over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons provided above with respect to amended Claim 1. Claims 51-52 depend directly from amended Claim 50 and are, therefore, distinguished from the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as amended Claim 50.

Claims 53-55:

Claim 53 is amended to recite (in part) that “communication via each of the data paths connected to no more than two of the computers is carried out through the processors of the no more than two computers connected to the data path.” Therefore, amended Claim 53 distinguishes over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons provided above with respect to amended Claim 1. Claims 54-55 depend directly from amended Claim 53 and are, therefore, distinguished from the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as amended Claim 53.

Claim 56:

Claim 56 is amended to recite (in part) that “communication via each of the data paths is carried out through the processors of the associated pair of computers connected to the data path.” Therefore, amended Claim 56 distinguishes over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons provided above with respect to amended Claim 1.

Claim 57:

Claim 57 is amended to recite (in part) that “communication via each of the data paths is carried out through the processors of the associated pair of computers connected to the data path.” Therefore, amended Claim 57 distinguishes over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons provided above with respect to amended Claim 1.

Claim 58:

Claim 58 is amended to recite (in part) that “communication via each of said sets of said data lines connected to no more than two of said computers is carried out through said processors of said no more than two of said computers connected to said set of said data lines.” Therefore, amended Claim 58 distinguishes over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons provided above with respect to amended Claim 1.

Claim 59:

Claim 59 is amended to recite (in part) that “communication via each of said sets of said interconnecting dedicated data lines is carried out through said processors of said individual computer and said one of said nearest neighbor computers connected to said set of interconnecting dedicated data lines.” Therefore, amended Claim 59 distinguishes over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons provided above with respect to amended Claim 1.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of all the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

New Claims:

New Claim 60 is added. Support for new Claim 60 is provided in Applicant’s original specification at least at page 2, lines 11-17 and page 8, lines 6-11. No new matter is added.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants believe that Claims 1-26, 29-30, 34-36, and 40-60 are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner undertake any action other than allowance of Claims 1-26, 29-30, 34-36, and 40-60, or if the Examiner has any questions or suggestions for expediting the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's attorney at (269) 279-8820.

Respectfully submitted,

April 12, 2010

/Larry E. Henneman, Jr./

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Larry E. Henneman, Jr., Reg. No. 41,063  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Henneman & Associates, PLC  
70 N. Main St.  
Three Rivers, MI 49093

**CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8(a))**

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being electronically-filed with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

April 12, 2010

/Larry E. Henneman, Jr./

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Larry E. Henneman, Jr.